DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 764 FL 024 858

AUTHOR Chen, H. Julie; Cramer, Peter K.; Kojima, Toshihisa
TITLE Japanese and American Cross-Cultural Business Pragmatics: A Study.
PUB DATE 1996-04-00
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Languages and Communication for World Business and the Professions (14th, Ypsilanti, MI, April 11-13, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; Business Administration; *Business Communication; *Cultural Differences; *Culture Conflict; Foreign Countries; *Intercultural Communication; *Pragmatics; *Sociocultural Patterns; Stereotypes
IDENTIFIERS Japan; Japanese People; United States

ABSTRACT

A study examined the extent to which culture-specific traits persist or change in American and Japanese business people who interact in business. Data were drawn from 13 interviews with both Japanese and American employees of Japanese companies. Interviewees were asked about their perceptions or stereotypes of people from the other culture before their initial contact with anyone from that culture, then about their current perceptions of business professionals and the business environment from that culture, focusing on changes in perception based on experience. General questions about frustration or confusion encountered in cross-cultural business interactions were also asked. Analysis of the interviews revealed ten major categories and 20 sub-categories for Japanese-American cross-cultural business pragmatics. Categories include: background; company profile; work (subcategories: attitude; territory; layout; workload); collegial relations/tsukiai; communication (subcategories: disagreement; body language; misunderstanding/breakdown; English language competence; thought pattern); decision-making (subcategories: timing; group vs. individual; power; technique); meeting (subcategories: participant inclusion; language problems; function; seating arrangement); training (subcategories: English language training; company training); negotiation/settai; and strategies for cross-cultural communication. Each category is discussed further. (Contains 19 references.) (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Running head: BUSINESS PRAGMATICS

ED 412 764

Japanese and American Cross-Cultural Business Pragmatics: A Study

H. Julie Chen, Peter K. Cramer, and Toshihisa Kojima

Indiana University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Julie Chen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL024858

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Japanese and American Cross-Cultural Business Pragmatics: A Study

The results of Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig's (1991) study suggest that nonnative speakers, even those who are regarded as highly linguistically proficient, often do not know or follow context-specific, sociocultural constraints. Due to the differences between languages in social rules of speaking (Hymes, 1972; Wolfson, 1983), inability to understand what is meant by what is said may occur, resulting in "pragmatic failure" (Thomas, 1983, p. 91). Especially in business this may cause costly mistakes. Since North-American and Japanese culture differ widely, misunderstandings of the kind mentioned above may happen quite frequently and thus offer a rich field for investigation. The Japanese trait of avoiding direct confrontation, for example, may work in a Japanese environment, but when it is transplanted to the US, even a proficient Japanese speaker of English may experience difficulties. Graham (1989) in his research on Japanese-US bargaining strategies found that "to avoid conflict and embarrassment, they [the Japanese] may sidestep, beat around the bush, or even remain silent" (p. 14). Graham goes on explaining that Japanese executives who were educated in a Western tradition are trying hard but that conflict avoidance is deeply rooted in Japanese society

The purpose of this study was to examine in how far culture-specific traits persist or change both in American and Japanese business people who deal with each other in business interactions.

Speech Acts and Pragmatic Transfer

The cross-cultural study of speech acts (e.g., greetings, compliments, apologies, leave taking, disagreement, refusals, etc.) is vital to the understanding of international communication. In this area of research, several types of speech acts, including disagreement and refusals, are particularly important to be studied because they are the source of many instances of cross-cultural miscommunication (Beebe & Takahashi, 1989).

In one of their studies, Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) conducted a discourse completion task, which consists of descriptions of scenarios that call for refusals as a response. In the task, American and Japanese subjects carried out refusals in the ways they considered appropriate under the circumstances described in the scenarios. The responses were analyzed into semantic segments according to a taxonomy Beebe et al. (1990) developed. The results of this study indicate that the Japanese subject transferred sociocultural rules of their native language into English and employed the same semantic strategies in English as they do in Japanese. The transfer is considered negative since it results in responses incomprehensible or infelicitous to the American ear (see also Takahashi & Beebe, 1987 for similar views).

Stereotypes

Many Americans are still preoccupied with prevalent stereotypes about the indirectness of Japanese, and it is also commonly believed by Japanese that Americans are always very direct. Deutsch (1983), for example, advises Americans who have

business connections with Japanese that "it is not appropriate, according to Japanese custom, to criticize someone openly, thus causing him to lose face" (p. 182).

However, to think that Japanese are always indirect may be an oversimplification. According to Komatsu (Beebe & Takahashi, 1989), a famous simultaneous interpreter in Japan, in talking to people of higher or equal status, Japanese try to avoid disagreement. However, in talking to people of lower status, the disagreement is very direct, such as "I disagree. You are wrong" (Komatsu, 1987; cited in Beebe & Takahashi, 1989). Komatsu's observation is supported in another study by Beebe and Takahashi (1989), in which the subjects, in the Discourse Completion Task, were asked to speak like a corporate executive who disagrees with an assistant's proposal. 85% of the Japanese subjects stated an explicit criticism about their subordinate's proposal, while only 50% of the American subjects did so.

Business Pragmatics

The need of business practitioners for advice on how to do business in cross-cultural settings has generated a plethora of instructional materials. The authors of such publications provide various categories of cross-cultural differences in business interactions. Condon (1984), for example, gives an elaborate list of communication and managerial styles in his widely acclaimed book, With Respect to the Japanese. In their guidelines for trainers and negotiators, Casse and Deol (1985) provide several lists that compare different cultures with respect to their negotiation styles. Another taxonomy of cross-cultural

differences in negotiations was generated by Griffin and Daggatt (1990). Based on their experience as business practitioners they developed a list of 12 categories of cross-cultural differences in negotiation styles. There is considerable overlap in these taxonomies. Figure 1 summarizes categories for cross-cultural interaction patterns in business as found by Condon (1984), Casse and Deol (1985), and Griffin and Daggatt (1990).

Unlike Graham's study that was conducted in a videotaped laboratory situation or some studies in pragmatics that worked with written discourse completion tasks (DCT's), the study at hand used audiotaped interviews for data elicitation. Because of time and budget restrictions, its scope was relatively narrow. Designed to be a pilot study using findings in sociolinguistics as well as business pragmatics as a preliminary orientation, this project tried to establish categories of Japanese-American business interactions. In turn, these would be used to inform a large scale follow-up study.

Of particular interest was the question of change and cultural adaptation. Would prolonged exposure to each other's culture change some of the attitudes that, as mentioned before, seem to be deeply ingrained in one's culture?

Method

We first obtained addresses of Japanese companies in the state of Indiana from a directory provided by the Department of Commerce and then called these companies. We asked for a face-to-face interview with American and Japanese employees (mainly upper

management) to get insights into how Japanese-US cross-cultural business interactions were experienced by them.

All in all, we conducted thirteen interviews; nine of them were permitted by the interviewees to be audio recorded. With respect to the interview questions, although each of us developed his or her own interview guide, the core questions addressed in all three interview guides were very similar. In addition, to maintain the flow of the interviews, the interview guides were not always followed identically. Nonetheless, the essential questions in the guides were all covered during the interviews.

The interviews generally began with an opening statement about the cultural differences between Japan and the US and how this might influence cross-cultural interaction in business settings. The purpose of the project was then explained to the interviewees. The interviewees were also informed that the interviews were part of a pilot study in which we, the research team, hoped to discover general scenarios of cross-cultural business communication and that the interviewees' input on the issue would be helpful to design a larger scale study in the future and produce more realistic training materials.

The second part of the interviews focused on cross-cultural interaction. The interviewees were asked about their perception or stereotypes of people from the other (i.e., Japanese or American) culture prior to their initial contact with any person from that culture. The interviewees then were asked to talk about their current perception of business professionals and the business environment from the other culture and whether it had

changed, now that they had more experience in cross-cultural business interaction. We then followed with general questions with respect to the frustration or confusion encountered in cross-cultural business settings. In order to get the interviewees to discuss more specific instances, we used prompts such as "What do you think about the ways Americans/Japanese express their disagreement or refusals?" and "Does that make you uncomfortable?" The interviewees were also given a few scenarios to react to. One scenario was as follows:

> If you have an assistant who just came from Japan (or who is going to Japan) and does not know much about the American (or Japanese) culture or has little experience with American (or Japanese) business professionals, what would you tell him about American (or Japanese) business professionals so that he knows what to expect and how to interact with them appropri tely?

Such scenarios were used to elicit each interviewee's perception about appropriate reactions in cross-cultural business settings in a somewhat controlled format. This format also enabled the researchers to observe individual variability and compare probable behavior in simulated situations. Concrete situations such as the one given in the scenario above may have helped the interviewees to respond as they would in more naturalistic situations.

The interviewees were selected based primarily on accessibility and relevance to the purpose of the study. The preliminary nature of the study prevented the investigators from involving a large population and from doing random sampling.

Transcribing Interviews

Nine interviewees permitted audio recording. The recordings were later transcribed verbatim into English . There were a few instances in which the interviewees were inaudible or unintelligible, partly due to the fact that not all of them were native speakers of English. In addition, in the interview transcripts, fillers such as uhum and umm were omitted to facilitate the analysis of the conversations. The identities of the interviewees were also protected, and each interview and interviewee are referred to by a number, starting from Interview 1 and Interviewee 1 respectively in the transcripts and the discussion below. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the interviewees.

Processing Interviews

After all the audio-recorded interviews were transcribed, each of us read through the transcripts, making initial categorizations according to individual reactions to the topics and aspects the interviewees discussed. Each topical segment in the interviews was summarized in the margin of the transcript with terms the interviewees used. Then, we got together to go over all the interviews until we reached agreement over the categorization and the terms used for each topical segment. The relevant terms were then grouped into main- and sub-categories. A list of "Categories of Cross-Cultural Differences in Business" extracted from Condon (1984, pp. 64-66), Casse and Deol (1985, p. 10) and Griffin and Daggat (1990, p. 120) served as a rough orientation guide (see Figure 1).

Results and Discussion

Ten major categories plus 20 sub-categories for Japanese-American cross-cultural business pragmatics emerged from the interview data (see Appendix). They were (a) background, (b) company profile, (c) work (with subcategories of attitude, territory, layout, and workload), (d) collegial relations/tsukiai, (e) communication (with subcategories including disagreement, body language, misunderstanding/breakdown, ESL competence, and thought pattern), (f) decision making (with subcategories of (timing, group vs. individual, power, and technique), (g) meeting (with subcategories of participant inclusion, language problems, function, and seating arrangement), (h) training (with subcategories of ESL training, and company training), (i) negotiation (settai), and (j) strategies for cross-cultural communication.

In the following discussion of the categories, we will not follow the order established in Appendix, but try to describe the findings as they tie in thematically. Also, some categories may only be mentioned marginally or omitted depending on how much information they yielded throughout the interviews.

When the interviewees mentioned their educational background, work experience, and cross-cultural experience among other factors, the segment was categorized as background. Most of the Japanese respondents had been working in the US for more than three years. As far as cultural adaptation is concerned, Goldman (1992) in his article on inter-organizational communication training mentions that "Japanese may become more argumentative and

express disagreements in public, while Americans become more patient, less verbose and gradually embrace silence and ambiguity in their interaction with Japanese" (p. 207). Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) argue that "it appears that people take three or more years of cross-cultural experience to become interculturally sophisticated" (p. 432).

During their stay in the US, Japanese will go through a learning process that may sometimes be painful and be accompanied by trial and error. This can be seen in a category that was found and that labeled disagreement.

Disagreeing or refusing is a face-threatening act which requires politeness strategies for saving face (see Brown & Levinson, 1978 for the notion of face). The ways people disagree are found to be quite different between American and Japanese cultures. One interviewee, an American, said, "[Japanese] are more reluctant to say no" (Interview 5). Another interviewee, this time a Japanese said, "Japanese think it's not right to say no" (Interview 7).

This tendency of the Japanese to be reluctant to say no explicitly can especially be seen in the category of meetings. An American manager remarked that "American meetings tend to be free. . . . emotions are expressed quite openly, anger, table pounding perhaps. . . . That's not true in a Japanese company. Meetings are very correct, no one is offended" (Interview 5). This is in accordance with the classification of conflict and confrontation, category No. A8 (see Figure 1).

Also, formal meetings for the Japanese may have no more than a ceremonial meaning. Nothing may be decided in the meeting itself. Rather, decisions may be made either before or after the formal meeting. As found in the category, function, this may explain the formalness of Japanese meetings. An American interviewee said, "You don't walk away generally from a meeting setting and know where you are standing. That's typical when you negotiate with Japanese" (Interview 6). A Japanese interviewee also acknowledges the point by saying, "For Japanese, that kind of negotiation meeting is kind of formal situation. So, it's a kind of ceremony. . . . I think usually Japanese don't express their opinion. (Interview 2)

Refusals and disagreement of Japanese are often expressed through body language, another one of the categories that was found. Body language is a form of nonverbal communication in which messages are conveyed through various body movements. Sometimes, body language is used in place of verbalization when one has to disagree. Interviewee 5, an American said, "more traditionally Japanese, . . . they'll give mannerisms when they are [in] doubt about something" (Interviewee 5). To facilitate business interactions, Americans have to become aware of nonverbal cues given by the Japanese. Conversely, in order to work efficiently in an interaction with American business people in the US, the Japanese businessperson has to learn to express refusals more directly.

However, to assume that Americans are always more direct may be a gross exaggeration and can result in more problems in cross-

cultural settings as the following example will show. This is what a Japanese accountant working in an American company said:

> Yeah. . . . sometimes Japanese think that direct expression is good in the United States. In Japan indirect expression is good but Japanese have been told that direct expression, direct conversation is good in the United States. So sometimes Japanese English is very direct, like "Do something" or "Get that" or something like that is very impolite here, but Japanese think it's OK, it's American way, but it's a really big misunderstanding and people in the United States are using a lot of indirect expression, also, like Japanese. (Interview 2)

Another category, actually a category that could include most of the categories discussed in this paper, was named misunderstanding. Incidents like the following have not been widely investigated but can be used as prime examples in cultural awareness seminars. The following incident happened in an Indiana subsidiary of a large Japanese company and was recalled by an American manager:

> Several months ago she [an American secretary] was in the [Japanese] president's office for some reason, and she yawned, and he took a high amount of offense to the yawn from her, and so it really ended up everybody was mad, you know, that it got to a point where she was yelling at him and he was yelling at her over a yawn, so those kinds of things, little nitpicking things, happen. (Interviewee 3)

There are, however, signs that Japanese business people adapt to American business practices and that they prefer these to Japanese practices. In the category workload, a subcategory of work, there was an interesting comment on workload in Japan versus workload in the US given by a Japanese interviewee who works for an American company. After mentioning that he thought Japanese offices were very inefficient, he said:

> Japanese think teamwork is very important. So even if you don't have anything to do, you stay with your colleagues. If you finish your job you can go home, but still Japanese are (pause), let's see, and this is really stupid. In the daytime Japanese are playing in the company. Sometimes, they, I mean, they go out and they go rest in a cafe or something, in the daytime, during daytime and in the night they work to catch up. So it's very inefficient. Not every day, not everyone, but Japanese business society is very inefficient. (Interview 2)

The interviewee expressed much satisfaction about his workload and working hours in the US. company he worked for. This may reflect a trend towards more leisure and less work that seems to be more widespread among young Japanese "salarymen" in Japan. In a recent book by Clayton Naff (1994), titled About Face, the author quotes a 1993 Japanese government survey of 10,000 Japanese which "found that the top priorities for the future are personal happiness and leisure" (p. 33). In a country like the US, this might be achieved more easily than in Japan because employees of American

companies do not have to perform as many social functions within their companies as Japanese.

Another category that turned up in the interviews was collegial relations (tsukiai). Tsukiai, a Japanese word meaning socializing, sometimes seems to refer to the practice of Japanese employees to go to places such as bars and golf courses with colleagues after work. Tsukiai may be viewed as an occasion in which Japanese can get rid of formality to some extent and discuss issues relatively freely. This is in line with the classification of social interaction by Condon, category No. A9 (see Figure 1).

In response to a question about whether or not he has to spend time after work socializing with colleagues, Interviewee 5, an American, said, "That's true in Japan. But that's not true in [our company]. . . . There are no demands at all placed on the Americans" (Interview 5).

Asked how much time he spends with his American colleagues outside the workplace, Interviewee 2, a Japanese, said, "It is really rare to eat out with a colleague after work, rare. But in Japan, it's almost every day" (Interview 2).

One general tendency that was discovered during the course of the interviews with Japanese interviewees was their tendency to keep to themselves. Hardly ever did they seem to make efforts to contact the local community or to socialize with American colleagues. Kelley, Whatley and Worthley's study, "Assessing the Effects of Culture on Managerial Attitudes: A Three-Culture Test" (1987), investigates the influence of culture, on management behavior, as opposed to other variables such as context and

environment and argues for some persistent cultural characteristics. The isolation Japanese business people displayed may be an effort to maintain their culture and thus might be an expression of a persistent cultural characteristic. Okazaki-Luff (1991) argues in a similar vein, saying that Japanese abroad experience difficulties in communicating with their hosts and tend to stay within their own networks. However, their isolation may also be a reflection of the difficulties of contacting people in a more rural, less multiracial environment that itself may not be willing to contact people outside their own ethnic circle.

A trait of Japanese business pragmatics that is often misunderstood by Americans was categorized as settai, meaning reception in Japanese, a subcategory of negotiation. It refers to the custom of Japanese companies to entertain their customers by taking them to places like bars. Settai can be a means of real negotiation or pre-negotiation. However, some Americans fail to see the negotiation part of the encounter and perceive this get together as a waste of time. Interviewee 6 knew of the conventions when he said, "when you go to Japan . . . you go to bars . . . they will bring up the business issue. . . . You'll settle the issue, and it's a done deal" (Interview 6). A Japanese interviewee pointed out as follows: "[for the] Japanese . . .the major decision making is not made until you get to know [each other]" (Interview 1).

As far as the categories of decision making and power in Japanese owned companies are concerned, mixed messages from the American interviewees were received. Whereas Interviewee 5

perceived that Americans contributed to decision making on higher levels, Interviewee 3 was very pessimistic. Here are their statements: "Although he is [an American] vice president . . ., he is relied upon . . . by our Japanese president for advice, so he is the most influential person in the company. (Interview 5) In contrast, Interviewee 3, also an American, states:

> But at the same time well, shifting, if I can shift a little bit here. I also feel that and I don't know if it is typical of all the Japanese companies or not but my level in the company is very limited. I think all the American positions within this company are limited as to, you know, what they can attain. (Interview 3)

The length of time it takes to make a decision, as indicated in the category, timing, was found to be different between the US and Japan. Decision-making is a fairly quick process for Americans, whereas Japanese tend to take far more time to make a decision. This is in line with the classification of decision making, category No. A7 (see Figure 1).

One interviewee said, "I think our [American] tendency is to, to move more quickly, I think your [Japanese] culture says let's move, let's think through, more slowly" (Interview 9). Another mentioned, "[Japanese decision making is] very slow, very long-term oriented, as opposed to short term" (Interview 6). Yet another interviewee said, "American people have the tendency to just do it, Japanese people discuss it a long time" (Interview 7/J: 160-162).

Another category, group vs. individual, emerged under a major category of decision making when it was found that the Japanese process of decision making can sometimes be frustrating for American business professionals who tend to involve fewer people in the process. The Japanese prefer collective decision making on the basis of group consensus as in the classification of decision making, category No. A7, B3, and C3 (see Figure 1). One interviewee said, "The Japanese do believe in consulting various parties to the decision, making sure everyone is at least aware of what is being proposed" (Interview 5).

When decisions are made, a Japanese concept is that every detail of the issues has to be presented and understood by everybody in a group. An American interviewee said, "it takes longer with Japanese, because . . . everybody in the group must understand" (Interview 6).

As expressed in the category attitude under a major category of work, Japanese may put more emphasis on group interests than Americans, resulting in increasing their commitment to the company. One interviewee said, "Japanese think what can I do for the company" (Interview 7). The finding is in line with the classification of group vs. individual behavior, category No. A1 and C7 (see Figure 1).

For Americans, meeting members of the Japanese negotiation team can sometimes be a painful experience, even for those who have had extensive exposure to the Japanese business culture. As reflected in the category participant inclusion under a major category of meeting, Japanese-style meetings seem to include as

many people who are related to the issue as possible as an American interviewee puts, "in Japan . . . you have a meeting with a group of people, and they drive you crazy" (Interview 6).

Seating arrangement, another category under meeting, can be an important consideration in planning a meeting in Japanese and Japanese-affiliated companies. Based on relative rankings of the participants to the meetings, seating may be set. For example, guests are more likely to be directed to sit closer to the door to the room, while the persons from the host company tend to sit at the other side of the table which is farther from the door.

In Japanese-affiliated companies, however, seating arrangement may be enforced only when important Japanese customers attend the meeting as Interviewee 9, an American, observes: "If we have Japanese visitors, especially high ranking visitors, there is a seating order. That is very important" (Interview 9).

Sometimes decisions are made on the basis of the negotiation between a parent company in Japan and an affiliated company in the United States over such means as telephone and fax. Because of language problems, miscommunication can occur at times. As can be seen in the category technique, a sub-category of decision making, most of the companies seem to be aware of such problems and come up with techniques, such as double-checking, to clarify every time they have some doubt about the intentions of the other side.

Within the category of Training, findings in the subcategory, ESL Training, revealed that overemphasis on grammar over communicative skills in formal English education in Japan may substantially account for the lack of communicative competence

among many Japanese people. Interviewee 7 represents what was said by almost all of the Japanese interviewees: "Japanese people have chance to study American culture. They have a chance to study English at least six years. Still they have difficulty to speak" (Interview 7). The point made by the Interviewee 7 also relates to the category of ESL competence under the major category of communication.

Thought pattern is another category under communication. Even when people are speaking in a second language, they may still be thinking in their native language, keeping the thought pattern intact. This possibility was mentioned in several interviews. Mentioning that speaking in English to Americans can sometimes confuse them, a Japanese interviewee said, "I don't know why exactly, but even when Japanese speak English, their way of thinking is still Japanese" (Interview 2). It may be that different thought patterns are rooted in differences in the two cultures.

The category company training emerged as instances of companies offering cultural and language training were mentioned by the interviewees. For example, when a Japanese company sends its Japanese employees to its affiliated company in the United States, it may provide cultural training before the departure as Interviewee 5 stated: "they go through a fair amount of training in Japan before they come over here. . . . explain to them the culture, what's like to work here, what the Americans are like" (Interview 5).

A company in the United Stated may also send its employees to Japan. Interviewee 5 said, "We've only sent one . . . to work in Japan, and what we did with him is send him to a Japanese language and culture immersion course for two weeks. We use Berlitz" (Interview 5).

Japanese companies, mainly larger corporations, offer cultural training sessions, too: "Some of those middle executives people started to learn the way international business has to be" (Interview 1)

Finally, the interviewees made suggestions with regard to how to improve cross-cultural communication based on their experiences. Such suggestions were categorized as strategies for cross-cultural communication. One example reflects the spirit of most of the responses. "We must really make the effort to understand. We must trust. . . . And we should try to get to know each other personally" (Interview 9). As trite as it may sound, getting to know each other personally may be the key to better communication between members of the two cultures. In their article "Perceptions of Social Penetration in Japanese-North American Dyads" (1987), Gudykunst, Nishida, and Chua argue, based on Altman and Taylor's (1973) social penetration theory, that "the influence of culture on inter-cultural relationships decreases as the relationships become more intimate" (p.176).

Conclusions

As could be seen in the analysis, categories of cross-cultural differences between American and Japanese business people do concur to some extent with the taxonomies established in

previous publications. Furthermore, a stay abroad can change the intensity and quality of behaviors within the categories as was mentioned in Goldman (1992, p. 195-215). Thus, for example, some Japanese business people in the United States tended to work less (still more than their American colleagues) than in their home countries. Also, less emphasis was put on the importance of seating arrangement by the Japanese working in Indiana. Thus, a trend toward adapting toward more American business practices can be seen. The intensity of change may depend on variables such as company culture and exposure to the other culture, but also on the willingness to change, a point mentioned by Bhawuk and Brislin (1992).

So far, this study provided different facets of Japanese and American business pragmatics among employees of Japanese-American enterprises in Indiana. Still, the image that is portrayed is full of contradicting messages. For example, in one company, American managers do not seem to have much influence on the decision making process, whereas in the other company the senior American manager seems to be quite influential.

The categories of cross-cultural differences in business pragmatics between Japanese and Americans as established in the pilot study have only limited validity since the sample they were based on was very small. Previous research, such as Graham's work suffers from the same lack of external validity as the pilot study, making generalizations difficult if not impossible.

Thus, to give a more consistent image of the phenomenon, a larger study with random sampling and the use of a representative

sample of the population is needed. A large scale study based on the findings of the pilot study has been designed with special emphasis on disagreement in Japanese-American business interactions. A combination of interviews and questionnaires that involves a sample of 60 American and 60 Japanese business people tries to uncover a more generalizable pattern.

References

Beebe, L. M., & Takahashi, T. (1989). Sociolinguistic variation in face-threatening speech acts: Chastisement and disagreement. In M. R. Eisenstein (Ed.), The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation (pp. 199-218). New York: Plenum Press.

Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Anderson, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), On the development of communicative competence in a second language (pp. 55-73). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Brislin, R. (1992). The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16, 413-436.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), Questions and politeness (pp. 54-310). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Casse, P. & Deol, S. (1985). Managing intercultural negotiations. Washington, DC: Sietar.

Condon, J. (1984). With respect to the Japanese: A guide for Americans. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Deutsch, M. F. (1983). Doing business with the Japanese. New York: New American Library.

Goldman, A. (1992). Intercultural training of Japanese for US.-Japanese interorganizational communication. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16, 195-215.

Graham, John L., & Sano, Y. (1989). Smart bargaining: Doing business with the Japanese (Rev. ed.). Grand Rapids, PA: Ballinger.

Griffin, T. J., & Daggatt, W. R. (1990). The global Negotiator. New York: Harper Business.

Gudykunst, W. B., Nishida, T., & Chua, E. (1987). Perceptions of social penetration in Japanese-North American dyads. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 11, 171-189.

Hartford, B. S., & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1992). Closing the conversation: Evidence from the academic advising session. Discourse Processes, 15, 93-116.

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social setting. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication (pp. 35-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kelley, L., Whatley, A. & Worthley, R. (1987). Assessing the effects of culture on managerial attitudes: A three-culture test. Journal of International Business Studies, 18, 17-31.

Naff, C. (1994). About face: How I stumbled onto Japan's social revolution. New York: Kodansha America.

Okazaki-Luff, K. (1991). On the adjustment of Japanese sojourners: Beliefs, contentions, and empirical findings. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15, 85-102.

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, T. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. JALT Journal, 8, 131-155.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Applied Linguistic, 4, 91-112.

Wolfson, N. (1983). Rules of speaking. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), Language and communication (pp. 61-87). London: Longman.

Author Note

H. Julie Chen, Assistant Profession, English Department, Southeast Missouri State University; Peter K. Cramer, Ph.D. Candidate, Language Education Department, Indiana University; Toshihisa Kojima, Ph.D. Candidate, Language Education Department, Indiana University. The authors' names are arranged in alphabetical order.

"Japanese and American Cross-Cultural Business Pragmatics: A Study" Is based on a study conducted at the Language Education Department of Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. The three authors contributed equally to the study. The paper is based on a presentation at the Fourteenth Annual Eastern Michigan University Conference on Languages and Communication for World Business and the Professions, Ypsilanti, Michigan, April 1995. The authors are grateful to Dr. Martha Nyikos for her guidance, encouragement, and careful review on earlier drafts of the paper.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. H. Julie Chen, English Department, Southeast Missouri State University, Cape Girardeau, MO. 63701. Electronic mail may be sent via internet to hjchen@semovm.semo.edu.

Table 1

Profile of Interviewees

Interviewee	Nationality	Profile
1	Japanese	College Professor in Business
2	Japanese	Accountant in an American accounting company
3	American	Plant Manager of a Japanese-affiliated company
4	Japanese	President of a Japanese-affiliated company
5	American	Senior General Manager of a Japanese-affiliated company
6	American	Regional Manager of a Japanese-affiliated company
7	Japanese	President of a Japanese-affiliated company
8	Japanese	MBA student and section manager of a Japanese company
9	American	Vice President of a Japanese-affiliated company

Figure Caption

Figure 1. Categories for cross-cultural negotiation patterns.

CHART I

Condon (1984, pp. 64-66)
Communication and Management Styles US/Japan

A1 Basis of personal identification
US: individual
Japan: group

A2 Nature of interpersonal relations
US: independence, mutual agreement
J: interdependence, mutual obligations and expectations

A3 Valued qualities in work relationships
US: talent, experience, specialists
J: ability to get along with each other

A4 Promotion and mobility in work relations
US: merit, high upward mobility
J: seniority and merit, low upward mobility

A5 Preferred interpersonal communication channels
US: directness with same status indirect with subordinates
J: intermediaries essential prior to direct contact, direct and frequent contact between superiors and subordinates

A6 Communication Style
US: explicit, verbal
J: implicit, nonverbal

Casse & Deol (1985, p. 10)
A Tentative Comparative Study of Cultural Assumptions Related to Negotiation

B1 Emotions
US: Emotions are not highly valued. Transactions with others are mostly unemotional.
J: Emotions are valued but must be hidden.

B2 Power
US: power games are played all the time. Litigation, not so much conciliation. To be strong is highly valued.
J: Subtle power plays, conciliation is sought.

B3 Decision Making
US: Teamwork provides inputs to decision makers.
J: Group decision making

B4 Social interaction
US: Argumentative when right or wrong. Impersonal when arguing. Practical when presenting arguments.
J: Not very argumentative. Quiet when right. Respectful and patient. Modesty and self-restraints are highly valued.

Griffin & Daggat (1990, p. 120)
Twelve areas of differences in intercultural communication

The Nature of the Process
(for example, give and take or take it or leave it.)

C1 The Value of Time

C2 The Importance of Etiquette, Protocol and Ceremony

C3 The Decision Making Process

C4 The Importance of Principle and Honor

C5 The Use of Intermediaries

C6 The Make Up of the Negotiating Team

C7 The Appropriate Level of Trust

C8 The Importance of Individual versus Group Aspirations

C9 The Appropriate Manner of Communicating Information or Proposals

C10 The Appropriate Form of Final Agreement

A7 **Decision Making**
US: top-down, relatively fast, where necessary by vote, consensus not necessarily sought
J: upward (from middle or bottom of organization), relatively slow, consensus through lengthy discussion is sought

A8 **Conflict and Confrontation**
US: regarded as inevitable, not necessarily desirable; problems should be dealt with directly
J: conflicts and confrontation are to be avoided, harmony is a primary goal, conflict may be dealt with through intermediary

A9 **Social Interaction**
US: some degree of spontaneity, novelty is desired
J: predictability and ritualized interaction are valued until very clear friendships or working relationships are established.

A10 **Family and Work Loyalties**
US: immediate family relations may take precedence over work relations if in conflict.
J: Loyalty to organization is very strong and may take precedence over immediate family desires.

A11 **Time Orientation**
US: present and immediate future
J: past present and future

Appendix

Japanese/American Cross-Cultural Business Pragmatics:

Major Categories